

THE GENERICITY CONJECTURE

Sy D. Friedman*
MIT

The Genericity Conjecture, as stated in Beller-Jensen-Welch [82], is the following:

(*) If $O^\# \notin L[R]$, $R \subseteq \omega$ then R is generic over L .

We must be precise about what is meant by “generic”.

Definition. (Stated in Class Theory) A *generic extension* of an inner model M is an inner model $M[G]$ such that for some forcing notion $\mathcal{P} \subseteq M$:

- (a) $\langle M, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ is amenable and $\Vdash_p$ is $\langle M, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ -definable for Δ_0 sentences.
- (b) $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ is compatible, closed upwards and intersects every $\langle M, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ -definable dense $D \subseteq \mathcal{P}$.

A set x is *generic* over M if it is an element of a generic extension of M . And x is *strictly generic* over M if $M[x]$ is a generic extension of M .

Though the above definition quantifies over classes, in the special case where $M = L$ and $O^\#$ exists these notions are in fact first-order, as all L -amenable classes are Δ_1 definable over $L[O^\#]$. From now on assume that $O^\#$ exists.

Theorem A. *The Genericity Conjecture is false.*

The proof is based upon the fact that every real generic over L obeys a certain definability property, expressed as follows.

Fact. If R is generic over L then for some L -amenable class A , $\text{Sat}\langle L, A \rangle$ is *not* definable over $\langle L[R], A \rangle$, where $\text{Sat}\langle L, A \rangle$ is the canonical satisfaction predicate for $\langle L, A \rangle$.

Thus Theorem A is established by producing a real R s.t. $O^\# \notin L[R]$ yet $\text{Sat}\langle L, A \rangle$ is definable over $\langle L[R], A \rangle$ for each L -amenable A .

A weaker version of the Genericity Conjecture would state: If $O^\# \notin L[R]$ then either $R \in L$ or R is generic over some inner model M not containing R . This version of the conjecture is still open. However, this question can also be studied in contexts where $O^\#$ does *not* exist, for example when the universe has ordinal height equal to that of the minimal transitive model of ZF . In the latter context, Mack Stanley [93] has demonstrated the consistency of the existence of a non-constructible real which belongs to every inner model over which it is generic.

*Research Supported by the National Science Foundation, Grant #8903380–DMS.

Section A A Non-Generic Real below $\mathbf{O}^\#$.

We first prove the Fact stated in the introduction.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $R \subseteq \omega$ is generic over L . Then for some L -amenable class A , $\text{Sat}\langle L, A \rangle$ is **not** definable over $\langle L[R], A \rangle$ with parameters.*

Proof. Let $R \in L[G]$ where $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ is generic for $\langle L, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ -definable dense classes and $\mathcal{P}$ is L -amenable as in (a), (b) of the definition of generic extension. Let $A = \mathcal{P}$ and suppose that $\text{Sat}\langle L, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ were definable over $\langle L[R], \mathcal{P} \rangle$ with parameters. But the Truth Lemma holds for $G, \mathcal{P}$ for formulas mentioning $G, \mathcal{P}$: $\langle L[G], G, \mathcal{P} \rangle \models \phi(G, \mathcal{P})$ iff $\exists p \in G (p \Vdash \phi(G, \mathcal{P}))$, using the fact that $\Vdash$ in $\mathcal{P}$ for Δ_0 sentences is definable over $\langle L, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ and the genericity of G . So $\text{Sat}\langle L[G], G, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ is definable over $\langle L[G], G, \text{Sat}\langle L, \mathcal{P} \rangle \rangle$, since $\Vdash$ is definable over $\langle L, \text{Sat}\langle L, \mathcal{P} \rangle \rangle$ for arbitrary first-order sentences. Since $\text{Sat}\langle L, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ is definable over $\langle L[G], G, \mathcal{P} \rangle$ we get the definability of satisfaction for the latter structure over itself. This contradicts a well-known result of Tarski. $\neg$

The rest of this section is devoted to the construction of a real R such that R preserves L -cofinalities ($\text{cof}(\alpha)$ in $L = \text{cof}(\alpha)$ in $L[R]$ for every α) and for every L -amenable A , $\text{Sat}\langle L, A \rangle$ is definable over $\langle L[R], A \rangle$. (The proof has little to do with the Sat operator; any operator from L -amenable classes to L -amenable classes that is “reasonable” is codable by a real. We discuss this further at the end of this section.)

R will generically code a class f which is generic for a forcing of size $\infty^+ =$ least “ L -cardinal” greater than ∞ . Since this sounds like nonsense we suggest that the reader think of ∞ as some uncountable cardinal of V and then ∞^+ denotes $(\infty^+)^L$. Thus we will define a constructible set forcing $\mathcal{P}^\infty \subseteq L_{\infty^+}$ for adding a generic $f^\infty \subseteq \infty$ such that if $A \subseteq \infty$ is constructible then $\text{Sat}\langle L_\infty, A \rangle$ is definable over $\langle L_\infty[f^\infty], f^\infty, A \rangle$. Then we show how to choose the f^∞ ’s to “fit together” into an $f \subseteq \text{ORD}$ such that $\text{Sat}\langle L, A \rangle$ is definable over $\langle L[f], f, A \rangle$ for each L -amenable A . Finally, we code f by a real R (using the fact that $I =$ Silver Indiscernibles are indiscernibles for $\langle L[f], f \rangle$).

A condition in $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ is defined as follows. Work in L . An *Easton set of ordinals* is a set of ordinals X such that $X \cap \kappa$ is bounded in κ for every regular $\kappa > \omega$. For any $\alpha \in \text{ORD}$, 2^α denotes all $f : \alpha \rightarrow 2$ and $2^{<\alpha} = \cup \{2^\beta \mid \beta < \alpha\}$. An *Easton set of strings* is a set $D \subseteq \cup \{2^\alpha \mid \alpha \in \text{ORD}\}$ such that $D \cap 2^{<\kappa}$ has cardinality less than κ for every regular $\kappa > \omega$. For any $X \subseteq \text{ORD}$ let $\text{Seq}(X) = \cup \{2^\alpha \mid \alpha \in X\}$. A *condition* in $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ is (X, F, D, f) where:

- (a) $X \subseteq \infty$ is an Easton set of ordinals
- (b) $F : X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(2^\infty) =$ Power Set of 2^∞ such that for $\alpha \in X$, $F(\alpha)$ has cardinality $\leq \alpha$
- (c) $D \subseteq \text{Seq}(X)$ is an Easton set of strings
- (d) $f : D \rightarrow \infty$ such that $f(s) > \text{length}(s)$ for $s \in D$.

We define extension of conditions as follows. $(Y, G, E, g) \leq (X, F, D, f)$ iff

- (i) $Y \supseteq X$, $E \supseteq D$, $G(\alpha) \supseteq F(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in X$, g extends f

- (ii) If $s \in E - D$ then the interval $[\text{length}(s) + 1, g(s)]$ contains no element of X , and if $s \subseteq S \in F(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \leq \text{length}(s)$, $\alpha \in X$ then $g(s) \notin C_S$.

We must define C_S . For $S \in 2^\infty$ let $\mu(S) = \text{least p.r. closed } \mu > \infty \text{ such that } S \in L_\mu$ and then $C_S = \{\alpha < \infty \mid \alpha = \infty \cap \text{Skolem hull}(\alpha) \text{ in } L_{\mu(S)}\}$. Thus C_S is CUB in ∞ and $\langle L_\alpha, S \restriction \alpha \rangle \prec \langle L_\infty, S \rangle$ for sufficiently large $\alpha \in C_S$ (as $S \in \text{Skolem hull}(\alpha) \text{ in } L_{\mu(S)}$ for sufficiently large $\alpha < \infty$). Also note that $T \notin L_{\mu(S)} \longrightarrow C_T \subseteq \text{Lim } C_S \cup \alpha$ for some $\alpha < \infty$.

Our goal with this forcing is to produce a generic function f_G from $2^{<\infty}$ into ∞ such that for each $S \subseteq \infty$, $\{f(S \restriction \alpha) \mid \alpha < \infty\}$ is a good approximation to the complement of C_S . $S \in F(\alpha)$ is a commitment that for $\beta > \alpha$, $f(S \restriction \beta) \notin C_S$ (in stronger conditions).

Lemma 2. *If $p \in \mathcal{P}^\infty$ and $\alpha < \infty$, $S \in 2^\infty$, $s \in 2^{<\infty}$ then p has an extension (X, F, D, f) such that $\alpha \in X$, $S \in F(\alpha)$ and $s \in D$.*

Proof. Easy, given the fact that if s needs to be added then we can safely put $f(s) = \text{length}(s) + 1$. $\dashv$

Lemma 3. *$\mathcal{P}^\infty$ has the ∞^+ -chain condition (antichains have size $\leq \infty$, all in L of course).*

Proof. Any two conditions $(X, F, D, f), (X, G, D, f)$ are compatible, so an antichain has cardinality at most the number of (X, D, f) 's, which is ∞ . $\dashv$

Lemma 4. *Let G be $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ -generic and write f_G for $\cup\{f \mid (X, F, D, f) \in G \text{ for some } X, F, D\}$. If $S \in 2^\infty$ then $f_G(S \restriction \alpha) \notin C_S$ for sufficiently large $\alpha < \infty$.*

Proof. G contains a condition (X, F, D, f) such that $0 \in X$ and $S \in F(0)$. If $s \subseteq S$, $s \notin D$ then $f_G(s) \notin C_S$, by (ii) in the definition of extension. And $S \restriction \alpha \notin D$ for sufficiently large $\alpha < \infty$. $\dashv$

Lemma 5. *Let G, f_G be as in Lemma 4. If $\alpha < \infty$ is regular, $S \in 2^\infty$, and $\alpha \notin \text{Lim } C_S$ then $\{f_G(S \restriction \beta) \mid \beta < \alpha\}$ intersects every constructible unbounded subset of α .*

Proof. Let $A \subseteq \alpha$ be constructible and unbounded in α . We show that a condition (X, F, D, f) can be extended to $(X \cup \{\delta\}, F^*, D \cup \{S \restriction \delta\}, f^*)$ for some δ , where $f^*(S \restriction \delta) \in A$. Choose $\delta < \alpha$ large enough so that $S \restriction \delta$ is not an initial segment of any $T \in \cup\{F(\beta) \mid \beta \in X \cap \alpha\} - \{S\}$. This is possible since $X \cap \alpha$ is bounded in α and $F(\beta)$ has cardinality $< \alpha$ for each $\beta \in X \cap \alpha$. Then let $f^* = f \cup \{\langle S \restriction \delta, \beta \rangle\}$ where $\beta \in A - C_S - \delta$ and $F^* = F \cup \{\langle \delta, \emptyset \rangle\}$. $\dashv$

Lemma 6. *$\mathcal{P}^\infty$ preserves cofinalities (i.e., $\mathcal{P}^\infty \Vdash \text{cof}(\alpha) = \text{cof}(\alpha)$ in L for every ordinal α).*

Proof. For regular $\kappa < \infty$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}^\infty$ let $(p)^\kappa =$ “part of p below κ ”, $(p)_\kappa =$ “part of p at or above κ ” be defined in the natural way: if $p = (X, F, D, f)$ then

$$(p)^\kappa = (X \cap \kappa, F \restriction X \cap \kappa, D \cap \text{Seq } \kappa, f \restriction D \cap \text{Seq } \kappa) \text{ and}$$

$$(p)_\kappa = (X - \kappa, F \upharpoonright X - \kappa, D \cap \text{Seq}(\infty - \kappa), f \upharpoonright D \cap \text{Seq}(\infty - \kappa)).$$

Given p and predense $\langle \Delta_i | i < \kappa \rangle$ we find $q \leq p$ and $\langle \bar{\Delta}_i | i < \kappa \rangle$ such that $\bar{\Delta}_i \subseteq \Delta_i$ for all $i < \kappa$, $\text{card } \bar{\Delta}_i \leq \kappa$ for all $i < \kappa$ and each $\bar{\Delta}_i$ is predense below q . (Δ is *predense* if $\{r | r \leq \text{some } d \in \Delta\}$ is dense; it is *predense below* q if every extension of q can be extended into the afore-mentioned set.) This implies that if $\text{cof}(\alpha) \leq \kappa$ in some generic extension $L[G]$, G $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ -generic over L , then $\text{cof}(\alpha) \leq \kappa$ in L . Since $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ is ∞^+ -CC, this means that $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ preserves all cofinalities.

Given p and $\langle \Delta_i | i < \kappa \rangle$ as above first extend p to $p_0 = (X_0, F_0, D_0, f_0)$ so that $\kappa \in X_0$. Now note that if $r \leq p_0$ then $f^r(s) < \kappa$ for all $s \in D^r - D_0$ of length $< \kappa$ (where $r = (X^r, F^r, D^r, f^r)$), by condition (ii) in the definition of extension. Thus $\mathcal{F} = \{(X^r \cap \kappa, D^r \cap \text{Seq } \kappa, f^r \upharpoonright D^r \cap \text{Seq } \kappa) | r \leq p_0\}$ is a set of cardinality κ . Let $\langle (\Delta_i^*, (X^i, D^i, f^i)) | i < \kappa \rangle$ be an enumeration in length κ of all pairs from $\{\Delta_i | i < \kappa\} \times \mathcal{F}$.

Now we extend p_0 successively to $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots$ in κ steps so that $(p_i)^\kappa = (p_0)^\kappa$ for all $i < \kappa$, according to the following prescription: If p_i has been defined, see if it has an extension r_i extending some $d_i \in \Delta_i^*$ such that $(X^{r_i} \cap \kappa, D^{r_i} \cap \text{Seq } \kappa, f^{r_i} \upharpoonright D^{r_i} \cap \text{Seq } \kappa) = (X^i, D^i, f^i)$. If not then $p_{i+1} = p_i$. If so, select such an r_i, d_i and define p_{i+1} by requiring $(p_{i+1})^\kappa = (p_0)^\kappa$, $(p_{i+1})_\kappa = (r_i)_\kappa$ except enlarge $F^{p_{i+1}}(\kappa)$ so as to contain $F^{r_i}(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in X^{r_i} \cap \kappa$. For limit $\lambda \leq \kappa$ let p_λ be the greatest lower bound to $\langle p_i | i < \lambda \rangle$. Finally let $q = p_\kappa$.

Let $\bar{\Delta}_j \subseteq \Delta_j$ consist of all d_i in the above construction that belong to Δ_j , for $j < \kappa$. The claim we must establish is that each $\bar{\Delta}_j$ is predense below q . Here's the proof: suppose $\bar{q} \leq q$ and let $r \leq \bar{q}, r$ extending some element of $\bar{\Delta}_j$. Choose $i < \kappa$ so that $(\Delta_i^*, (X^i, D^i, f^i)) = (\Delta_j, (X^r \cap \kappa, D^r \cap \text{Seq } \kappa, f^r \upharpoonright D^r \cap \text{Seq } \kappa))$. Clearly at stage $i + 1$, it was possible to find r_i, d_i as searched for in the construction. It suffices to argue that $r_i, \bar{q}$ are compatible. Now $(r_i)_\kappa$ is extended by $(p_{i+1})_\kappa$ and hence by $(r)_\kappa$. And $(r_i)^\kappa$ is extended by $(r)^\kappa$, except possibly that $F^{r_i}(\alpha)$ may fail to be a subset of $F^r(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in X^r \cap \kappa$. And note that the extension $(r_i)_\kappa \geq (r)_\kappa$ obeys all restraint imposed by $F^{r_i}(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in X^r \cap \kappa$ since we included $F^{r_i}(\alpha)$ in $F^{p_{i+1}}(\kappa)$. Thus r_i and $\bar{q}$ are both extended by r , provided we only enlarge $F^r(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in X^r \cap \kappa$ to include $F^{r_i}(\alpha)$, $\dashv$

For future reference we state:

Corollary 6.1. *Suppose $\kappa < \infty$ is regular and $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{P}^\infty$ is predense. Let $\mathcal{P}_\kappa^\infty = \{(p)_\kappa | p \in \mathcal{P}^\infty\}$, $\mathcal{P}^{\infty, \kappa} = \{p \in \mathcal{P}^\infty | X^p \subseteq \kappa \text{ and } \text{Range}(f^p) \subseteq \kappa\}$ with the notion $\leq$ of extension defined as for $\mathcal{P}^\infty$. Then for any $q \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa^\infty$ there is $q' \leq q$ such that $\Delta^{q'} = \{r \in \mathcal{P}^{\infty, \kappa} | r \cup q' \text{ meets } \Delta, F^r(\alpha) \subseteq F^{q'}(\kappa) \text{ for all } \alpha \in X^r\}$ is predense on $\mathcal{P}^{\infty, \kappa}$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 6, successively extend q (after guaranteeing $\kappa \in X^q$) in κ steps to q' so that for any (X, D, f) if $r \cup q''$ meets Δ for some $q'' \leq q'$, some r such that $(X^r, D^r, f^r) = (X, D, f)$ then $r \cup q'$ meets Δ for some such r , where $F^r(\alpha) \subseteq F^{q'}(\kappa)$ for all $\alpha \in X^r$. Now note that if $r_0 \in \mathcal{P}^{\infty, \kappa}$ then $r_0 \cup q'$ has an extension meeting Δ so there is r_1 such that $(X^{r_1}, D^{r_1}, f^{r_1}) = (X^{r_0}, D^{r_0}, f^{r_0})$ and $r_1 \in \Delta^{q'}$. But then r_0 is compatible with r_1 so $\Delta^{q'}$ is predense on $\mathcal{P}^{\infty, \kappa}$, as desired. $\dashv$

Corollary 6.2. $\mathcal{P}^\infty \Vdash GCH$.

Proof. Suppose $f^\infty : \text{Seq}(\infty) \longrightarrow \infty$ is $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ -generic. It suffices to show that if $\kappa \leq \infty$ is regular, $A \subseteq \kappa$, $A \in L[f^\infty]$ then $A \in L[f^\infty \upharpoonright \text{Seq}(\kappa)]$. But the proof of Lemma 6 shows that given any $p \Vdash \dot{A} \subseteq \kappa$ there is $q \leq p$ such that for any $i < \kappa$, $\{r \leq q \mid (r)_\kappa = (q)_\kappa \text{ and } r \text{ decides } "i \in \dot{A}"\}$ is predense below q . This proves that there is $q \leq p$ such that $q \Vdash \dot{A} \in L[\dot{f}^\infty \upharpoonright \text{Seq}(\kappa)]$ and so by the genericity of f^∞ , $A \in L[f^\infty \upharpoonright \text{Seq}(\kappa)]$. $\dashv$

Next we embark on a series of lemmas aimed at showing that $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ -generics actually exist in $L[O^\#]$ when ∞ is any Silver indiscernible.

Lemma 7. *Suppose $i < j$ are adjacent countable Silver indiscernibles. Let $\pi = \pi_{ij}$ denote the elementary embedding $L \longrightarrow L$ which shifts each of the Silver indiscernibles $\geq i$ to the next one and leaves all other Silver indiscernibles fixed. Then there is a $\mathcal{P}_i^j$ -generic G_i^j such that if (X, F, D, f) belongs to G_i^j and $S \subseteq i$, $S \in L$ then $f(\pi(S) \upharpoonright \alpha) \notin C_{\pi(S)}$ for all $\pi(S) \upharpoonright \alpha \in D$.*

Proof. For any $k \in \omega$ let $\ell_1 < \dots < \ell_k$ be the first k Silver indiscernibles greater than j and let $j_k = j^+ \cap \Sigma_1$ Skolem hull of $j + 1 \cup \{\ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$ in L , $i_k = i^+ \cap \Sigma_1$ Skolem hull of $i + 1 \cup \{\ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$ in L . (Of course i^+, j^+ denote the cardinal successors to i, j in L .) Let j_k^* = least p.r. closed ordinal $\alpha > j_k$ such that $L_\alpha \models j$ is the largest cardinal. Finally let $C_k = \{\gamma < j \mid \gamma = j \cap \Sigma_1 \text{ Skolem hull } (\gamma \cup \{j\} \cup \{\ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}) \text{ in } L\}$, a CUB subset of j .

Now note that if $S \subseteq i$, $S \in L - L_{i_k}$ then $C_{\pi(S)} \subseteq C_k \cup \gamma$ for some $\gamma < i$. For, $\mu_{\pi(S)}$ is greater than or equal to j_k^* since otherwise $\pi(S)$ belongs to L_{j_k} and hence S belongs to L_{i_k} . Thus $C_{\pi(S)} \subseteq C_k \cup \gamma$ for some $\gamma < j$ since C_k is an element of $L_{j_k^*}$. But the least such γ is definable from elements of $i \cup$ (Silver Indiscernibles $\geq j$), so must be less than i .

Also note that the L -cofinality of j_k is equal to j : Consider $M =$ transitive collapse of Σ_1 Skolem hull of $j + 1 \cup \{\ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$. There is a partial $\underline{\Sigma}_1(M)$ function from a subset of j onto j_k , all of whose restrictions to ordinals $\gamma < j$ have range bounded in j_k . (This is why we are using Σ_1 Skolem hulls rather than full Σ_ω Skolem hulls.) Thus the L -cofinalities of j_k and j are the same, namely j .

Thus we may conclude the following: The set $\{\pi(S) \mid S \subseteq i, S \in L_{i_k}\} \in L_{j_k}$ (since it is a constructible bounded subset of L_{j_k}) and if $S \subseteq i$, $S \in L - L_{i_k}$ then $C_{\pi(S)}$ is disjoint from (i, γ_k) , where γ_k = least element of C_k greater than i .

Now we see how to build G_i^j . We describe an ω -sequence $p_0 \geq p_1 \geq \dots$ of conditions in $\mathcal{P}_i^j$ and take $G_i^j = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_i^j \mid p_k \leq p \text{ for some } k\}$. Let $\langle \Delta_k \mid k \in \omega \rangle$ be a list of all constructible dense sets on $\mathcal{P}_i^j$ so that for all k , Δ_k belongs to the Σ_1 Skolem hull in L of $i \cup \{i, j, \ell_1 \dots \ell_{k+1}\}$. This is possible since any constructible dense set on $\mathcal{P}_i^j$ belongs to $L_{j^{++}}$ and hence to the Σ_1 Skolem hull in L of $i \cup \{i, j, \ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$ for some k . We inductively define $p_0 \geq p_1 \geq \dots$ so that p_k belongs to the Σ_1 Skolem hull in L of $i^+ \cup \{j, \ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$. Let p_0 be the weakest condition in $\mathcal{P}_i^j$; $p_0 = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$. Suppose that $k > 0$ and p_{k-1} has been defined. Write

$p_{k-1} = (X, F, D, f)$. First obtain $\bar{p}_k$ by adding i to X if necessary and defining or enlarging $F(i)$ so as to include $\{\pi(S) \mid S \subseteq i, S \in L_{i_k}\}$. Then choose $p_k \leq \bar{p}_k$ to be L -least so that p_k meets Δ_{k-1} . This completes the construction.

We show that $p_k \in \Sigma_1$ Skolem hull in L of $i^+ \cup \{j, \ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$. By induction p_{k-1} belongs to this hull and by choice of $\langle \Delta_k \mid k \in \omega \rangle$, so does Δ_{k-1} . Now $\{\pi(S) \mid S \subseteq i, S \in L_{i_k}\}$ is the range of $f \upharpoonright i$ where f is a $\Sigma_1(L)$ partial function with parameters $j, \ell_1 \dots \ell_k$. The latter is because $\text{Range}(\pi \upharpoonright i_k)$ is just $j_k \cap \Sigma_1$ Skolem hull in L of $i \cup \{j, \ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$. But given a parameter x for the domain of this $\Sigma_1(L)$ partial function, its range becomes Σ_1 -definable in the sense that it is in the Σ_1 Skolem hull in L of $\{x, j, \ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$. As x can be chosen equivalently as an ordinal $< i^+$, we get that $\{\pi(S) \mid S \subseteq i, S \in L_{i_k}\}$ belongs to the Σ_1 Skolem hull in L of $i^+ \cup \{j, \ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$. Thus so does p_k . (Actually x can be chosen to be i_k .)

Finally we must check that if $p_k = (X_k, F_k, D_k, f_k)$ then $f_k(\pi(S) \upharpoonright \alpha) \notin C_{\pi(S)}$ for all $\pi(S) \upharpoonright \alpha \in D_k$, all $S \subseteq i$ in L . Assume that this is true for smaller k and we check it for k . Now if $S \in L_{i_k}$ then this is guaranteed by the fact that $\pi(S) \in \bar{F}_k(i)$, where $\bar{p}_k = (\bar{X}_k, \bar{F}_k, D_{k-1}, f_{k-1})$. If $S \in L - L_{i_k}$ then $C_{\pi(S)}$ is disjoint from (i, γ_k) , where $\gamma_k = j \cap \Sigma_1$ Skolem hull in L of $\gamma_k \cup \{j\} \cup \{\ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$ and $\gamma_k > i$. But then $\gamma_k > i^+$ so $C_{\pi(S)}$ is disjoint from $(i, \bar{\gamma}_k)$ where $\bar{\gamma}_k = \sup(j \cap \Sigma_1 \text{ Skolem hull in } L \text{ of } i^+ \cup \{j\} \cup \{\ell_1 \dots \ell_k\})$. Since $p_k \in \Sigma_1$ Skolem hull in L of $i^+ \cup \{j\} \cup \{\ell_1 \dots \ell_k\}$, it follows that $\text{Range}(f_k) \subseteq \bar{\gamma}_k$ and hence $\text{Range}(f_k)$ is disjoint from $C_{\pi(S)}$. $\dashv$

Lemma 8. *Suppose $i < j$ are adjacent Silver indiscernibles, G_i^j is $\mathcal{P}_i^j$ -generic over L as in Lemma 7 and G^i is $\mathcal{P}^i$ -generic over L . Then there exists G^j which is $\mathcal{P}^j$ -generic over L such that $G_i^j = \{(p)_i \mid p \in G^j\}$ and $q \in G^i \iff \pi_{ij}(q) \in G^j$.*

Proof. As before, let $\mathcal{P}^{j,i} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^j$ consist of all $p = (X^p, F^p, D^p, f^p)$ in $\mathcal{P}^j$ such that $X^p \subseteq i$ and $\text{Range}(f^p) \subseteq i$. For any $p \in \mathcal{P}^{j,i}$ we modify p to $\bar{p}$ as follows. For $S \in F^p(\alpha)$, $i \in C_S$ let $\bar{S} = \pi_{ij}(S \upharpoonright i)$. For $S \in F^p(\alpha)$, $i \notin C_S$ let $T \subseteq i$ be L -least so that $(T, C_T), (S, C_S)$ agree through $\sup(C_S \cap i)$ and let $\bar{S} = \pi_{ij}(T)$. Then $F^{\bar{p}}(\alpha)$ consists of all $\bar{S}$ for $S \in F^p(\alpha)$. Otherwise $p, \bar{p}$ agree: $(X^p, D^p, f^p) = (X^{\bar{p}}, D^{\bar{p}}, f^{\bar{p}})$.

If $p \in \mathcal{P}_i^j$ and $i \in X^p$ we let $Q(p)$ denote $\{q \in \mathcal{P}^{j,i} \mid F^q(\alpha) \subseteq F^p(i) \text{ for all } \alpha \in X^q\}$. Now define $\bar{G}^j = \{p \in \mathcal{P}^j \mid (p)_i \in G_i^j, i \in X^p, (p)^i \in Q((p)_i) \text{ and } \overline{(p)^i} \in \pi_{ij}[G^i]\}$. Note that if p_0, p_1 belong to $\bar{G}^j$ then p_0, p_1 are compatible because $(p_0)_i, (p_1)_i$ are compatible, the restraints from $(p_0)^i, (p_1)^i$ are “covered” by $F^{p_0}(i), F^{p_1}(i)$ and $\overline{(p_0)^i}, \overline{(p_1)^i}$ impose at least as much restraint below i as do $(p_0)^i, (p_1)^i$. Note that if $G^j = \{p \mid \bar{p} \leq p \text{ for some } \bar{p} \in \bar{G}^j\}$ then G^j is compatible, closed upwards and $G_i^j = \{(p)_i \mid p \in G^j\}$. Also $q \in G^i \iff \pi_{ij}(q) \in G^j$, using the hypothesis that G_i^j satisfies Lemma 7. So it only remains to show that $\bar{G}^j$ meets all constructible predense $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{P}^j$.

The first Corollary to Lemma 6 states that it is enough to show that $\bar{G}_i^j = \{(p)_i \mid p \in \bar{G}^j\}$ meets all constructible predense $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{P}_i^j$ and that for $p \in \bar{G}_i^j, \{q \in Q(p) \mid q = (r)^i \text{ for some } r \in \bar{G}^j\}$ meets all constructible $\Delta \subseteq Q(p)$ which are predense on $\cup\{Q(p^*) \mid p^* \leq p\} = \mathcal{P}^{j,i}$. The former assertion is clear

by the $\mathcal{P}_i^j$ -genericity over L of $G_i^j = \overline{G}_i^j$. To prove the latter assertion we must show that for $p \in \overline{G}_i^j$, $\{q \in Q(p) | \bar{q} \in \pi_{ij}[G^i]\}$ meets every constructible $\Delta \subseteq Q(p)$ which is predense on $\mathcal{P}^{j,i}$. Given such a Δ , let $\overline{\Delta} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^i$ be defined by $\overline{\Delta} = \{r \in \mathcal{P}^i | \pi_{ij}(r) = \bar{q} \text{ for some } q \text{ meeting } \Delta\}$. Note that $\overline{\Delta}$ is constructible because it equals $\{r \in \mathcal{P}^i | r = \pi_{ij}^{-1}(\bar{q}) \text{ for some } q \text{ meeting } \Delta\}$ and Δ has L -cardinality $\leq i$. We claim that $\overline{\Delta} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^i$ is predense on $\mathcal{P}^i$. Indeed, if $r \in \mathcal{P}^i$ then $\pi_{ij}(r) \in \mathcal{P}^{j,i}$ and therefore can be extended to some q meeting Δ . As $\bar{q} = \pi_{ij}(t)$ for some $t \leq r$ we have shown that r can be extended into $\overline{\Delta}$. By the $\mathcal{P}^i$ -genericity of G^i , choose $r \in \overline{\Delta} \cap G^i$. Then $\pi_{ij}(r) = \bar{q}$ where q meets Δ ; clearly $\bar{q} \in \pi_{ij}[G^i]$. $\dashv$

Lemma 9. *Let $i_1 < i_2 < \dots$ denote the first ω -many Silver indiscernibles and i_ω their supremum. Then there exist $\langle G^{i_n} | n \geq 1 \rangle$ such that G^{i_n} is $\mathcal{P}^{i_n}$ -generic over L and whenever $\pi : L \rightarrow L$ is elementary, $\pi(i_\omega) = i_\omega$ we have $p \in G^{i_n} \iff \pi(p) \in G^{\pi(i_n)}$.*

Proof. Note that any π as in the statement of the lemma restricts to an increasing map from $\{i_n | n \geq 1\}$ to itself, so $G^{\pi(i_n)}$ makes sense. We define G^{i_n} by induction on $n \geq 1$. Select G^{i_1} to be the $L[O^\#]$ -least $\mathcal{P}^{i_1}$ -generic (over L). Select $G_{i_1}^{i_2}$ as in Lemma 7 and use Lemma 8 to define G^{i_2} from $G_{i_1}^{i_2}, G^{i_1}$. Now suppose that G^{i_n} has been defined, $n \geq 2$. Then define $G_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}}$ to be $\{p \in \mathcal{P}_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}} | \pi_{i_1 i_n}(q) \leq p \text{ for some } q \in G_{i_1}^{i_2}\}$ where $\pi_{i_1 i_n}(i_m) = i_{m+n-1}$ for $m < \omega$, $\pi_{i_1 i_n}(j) = j$ for $j \in I - i_\omega$. Then $G_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}}$ is $\mathcal{P}_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}}$ -generic, using the $\leq i_1$ -closure of $\mathcal{P}_{i_1}^{i_2}$ and the fact that the collection of constructible dense subsets of $\mathcal{P}_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}}$ is the countable union of sets of the form $\pi_{i_1 i_n}(A)$, A of L -cardinality i_1 . Moreover $G_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}}$ obeys the condition of Lemma 7 since $G_{i_1}^{i_2}$ does and $\pi_{i_1 i_n}$ is elementary. Now define $G^{i_{n+1}}$ from $G_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}}, G^{i_n}$ using Lemma 8.

To verify $p \in G^{i_n} \iff \pi(p) \in G^{\pi(i_n)}$, note that this depends only on $\pi \upharpoonright L_{i_\ell}$ for some $\ell < \omega$ and any such map is the finite composition of maps of the form π_m , where $\pi_m(i_n) = i_{n+1}$ for $n \geq m$, $\pi_m(i_n) = i_n$ for $1 \leq n < m$. So we need only verify that for each $m, n, p \in G^{i_n} \iff \pi_m(p) \in G^{\pi_m(i_n)}$. This is trivial unless $m \leq n$ as $m > n \implies \pi_m(p) = p$ for $p \in G^{i_n} = G^{\pi_m(i_n)}$. Finally we prove the statement by induction on $n \geq m$. If $n = m$ then it follows from the fact that $G^{i_{n+1}}$ was defined from $G_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}}, G^{i_n}$ so as to obey the conclusion of Lemma 8. Suppose it holds for $n \geq m$ and we wish to demonstrate the property for $n + 1$. But $G^{i_{n+1}}$ is defined from $G_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}}, G^{i_n}$ as $G^{i_{n+2}}$ is defined from $G_{i_{n+1}}^{i_{n+2}}, G^{i_{n+1}}$. Clearly $\pi_m[G_{i_n}^{i_{n+1}}] \subseteq G_{i_{n+1}}^{i_{n+2}}$ and by induction $\pi_m[G^{i_n}] \subseteq G^{i_{n+1}}$. Thus $p \in G^{i_{n+1}} \implies \pi_m(p) \in G^{\pi_m(i_{n+1})}$. Conversely, $p \notin G^{i_{n+1}} \implies p$ incompatible with some $q \in G^{i_{n+1}} \implies \pi_m(p)$ incompatible with some $\pi_m(q) \in G^{\pi_m(i_{n+1})} \implies \pi_m(p) \notin G^{\pi_m(i_{n+1})}$. $\dashv$

Lemma 10. *There exist $\langle G^i | i \in I \rangle$ such that G^i is $\mathcal{P}^i$ -generic over L and whenever $\pi : L \rightarrow L$ is elementary, $p \in G^i \iff \pi(p) \in G^{\pi(i)}$.*

Proof. Let t denote a Skolem term for L ; thus $L = \{t(j_1 \dots j_n) | t \text{ a Skolem term, } t \text{ } n\text{-ary, } j_1 < \dots < j_n \text{ in } I\}$. Now define $t(j_1 \dots j_n) \in G^i$ iff $t(\sigma(j_1) \dots \sigma(j_n)) \in G^{\sigma(i)}$ where σ is the unique order-preserving map from $\{i, j_1 \dots j_n\}$ onto an initial segment of I . (G^i for $i < i_\omega$ is defined in Lemma 9.) We verify that this is well-defined: if $t_1(j_1 \dots j_n) = t_2(k_1 \dots k_m)$ then let σ^* be the unique order-preserving map from

$\{i, j_1 \dots j_n, k_1 \dots k_m\}$ onto an initial segment of I . Then $t_1(\sigma^*(j_1) \dots \sigma^*(j_n)) = t_2(\sigma^*(k_1) \dots \sigma^*(k_m))$. But $t_1(\sigma^*(j_1) \dots \sigma^*(j_n)) \in G^{\sigma^*(i)}$ iff $t_1(\sigma_1(j_1) \dots \sigma_1(j_n)) \in G^{\sigma_1(i)}$ where σ_1 is the unique order-preserving map from $\{i, j_1 \dots j_n\}$ onto an initial segment of I , using Lemma 9. The analogous statement holds for t_2 , so our definition is well-defined. The property $p \in G^i \iff \pi(p) \in G^{\pi(i)}$ is clear, using our definition. $\dashv$

Now we are almost done. For any $i \in I$ let $f^i = \cup\{f^p \mid p \in G^i\}$. Thus $f^i : 2^{<i} \longrightarrow i$. And let $f = \cup\{f^i \mid i \in I\}$, so $f : 2^{<\infty} \longrightarrow \infty$ (∞ now denotes *real* ∞ , that is, $\infty = \text{ORD}$).

Lemma 11. (a) For any L -amenable $A \subseteq \text{ORD}$, $\text{SAT}\langle L, A \rangle$ is definable over $\langle L[f], f, A \rangle$.

(b) I is a class of indiscernibles for $\langle L[f], f \rangle$.

(c) $L[f] \models \text{GCH}$.

Proof. (a) We treat A as an L -amenable function $A : \infty \longrightarrow 2$. By Lemmas 4,5 we have that for sufficiently large L -regular α , $\alpha \in \text{Lim } C_A \iff \text{Range of } f \upharpoonright \{A \upharpoonright \beta \mid \beta < \infty\}$ intersects every constructible unbounded subset of α (where C_A is defined for A to be the limit of $C_{A \upharpoonright i}$, $i \in I$). But for α sufficiently large in C_A , $\langle L_\alpha, A \upharpoonright \alpha \rangle \prec \langle L, A \rangle$ so $\text{Sat}\langle L, A \rangle$ is definable over $\langle L[f], f, A \rangle$.

(b) Clear by Lemma 10.

(c) By Corollary 6.2. $\dashv$

Finally, using the technique of the proof of Theorem 0.2 of Beller-Jensen-Welch [82], there is a real R such that f is definable over $L[R]$ and $I^R = I$. Thus we conclude.

Theorem 12. There is a real $R \in L[O^\#]$ such that:

(a) $L, L[R]$ have the same cofinalities

(b) $I^R = I$

(c) If A is an L -amenable class then $\text{Sat}\langle L, A \rangle$ is definable over $\langle L[R], A \rangle$.

By Lemma 1 we conclude:

Theorem A. The Genericity Conjecture is false.

We close this section by mentioning a generalization of the above treatment of the SAT operator to other operators on classes. For simplicity we first state our result in terms of ω_1 , rather than ∞ .

Theorem 13. Assume that $O^\#$ exists. Suppose F is a constructible function from $\mathcal{P}_L(\omega_1)$ to itself, where $\mathcal{P}_L(\omega_1) = \text{all constructible subsets of } (true) \omega_1$. Then there exists a real $R <_L O^\#$ such that $F(A)$ is definable over $\langle L_{\omega_1}[R], A \rangle$ for all $A \in \mathcal{P}_L(\omega_1)$.

Proof. Choose $\alpha < \omega_1$ so that F is definable in L from parameters in $\alpha \cup (I - \omega_1)$. Also we may construct F' , defined from the same parameters, so that for any $A \in \mathcal{P}_L(\omega_1)$, $F(A)$ is definable over $\langle L_{\omega_1}, A, B \rangle$ for

any unbounded $B \subseteq F'(A)$. Finally note that we may assume that $F'(A) \subseteq C_A$ for all A (where A is viewed as an element of 2^{ω_1}) since C_A is definable over $\langle L_{\omega_1}, A, B \rangle$ for any unbounded $B \subseteq C_A$.

For any $i \in I$, $\alpha \leq i \leq \omega_1$, let F'_i be defined in L just like F' , but with ω_1 replaced by i . Also define $\mathcal{P}^i$ as before but with C_S replaced by $F'_i(S)$ (viewing $S \in 2^i$ as a subset of i). Then as before we can construct a generic $f : 2^{<\omega_1} \rightarrow \omega_1$ so that for any $A \in \mathcal{P}_L(\omega_1)$, $F(A)$ is definable over $\langle L_{\omega_1}[f], A \rangle$. Finally code f generically by a real using the fact that α is countable and $I \cap (\alpha, \omega_1)$ is a set of indiscernibles for $\langle L_{\omega_1}[f], f \rangle$.
 $\dashv$

To deal with operators on L -amenable classes, we have to keep track of parameters.

Definition. Suppose $i < j$ belong to I and F_i is a counstructible function from $\mathcal{P}_L(i)$ to itself. Then $F_i^j : \mathcal{P}_L(j) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_L(j)$ is defined as follows: Write $F_i = t(\alpha, i, \vec{k})$ where t is a Skolem term for L , $\alpha < i$ and $\vec{k}$ are Silver indiscernibles greater than j . Then $F_i^j = t(\alpha, j, \vec{k})$.

Also define $F_i^\infty : L\text{-amenable classes} = \mathcal{P}_L(\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_L(\infty)$ as follows: Given an L -amenable A choose t and α so that for all $j \in I$ greater than α , $A \cap j = t(\alpha, j, \vec{k})$ where $\vec{k}$ are Silver indiscernibles greater than j . Then $F_i^\infty(A) = \cup \{F_i^j(A \cap j) \mid \alpha < j \in I\}$. An operator $F : \mathcal{P}_L(\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_L(\infty)$ is *countably constructible* if it is of the form $F_{\omega_1}^\infty$ where F_{ω_1} is a constructible function from $\mathcal{P}_L(\omega_1)$ to itself.

Theorem 14. Assume that $O^\#$ exists and $F : \mathcal{P}_L(\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_L(\infty)$ is countably constructible. Then there exists $R <_L O^\#$ such that $F(A)$ is definable over $\langle L[R], A \rangle$ for all $A \in \mathcal{P}_L(\infty)$.

Proof. Apply Theorem 13 to F_{ω_1} where $F = F_{\omega_1}^\infty$. The resulting real R satisfies the conclusion of the present Theorem.
 $\dashv$

Remarks. (a) The definitions of $F(A)$ over $\langle L_{\omega_1}(R), A \rangle$, $\langle L[R], A \rangle$ in Theorems 13, 14 respectively are independent of A .

(b) If $F : \mathcal{P}_L(\omega_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_L(\omega_1)$ is constructible then there exists a set-generic extension of L in which there is a real R obeying the conclusion of Theorem 13. However we cannot expect there to be such a real in $L[O^\#]$, or even compatible with the existence of $O^\#$. The key feature of our forcing $\mathcal{P}$ is that not only can it be used to produce a real R obeying the conclusion of Theorem 12 but such a real can be found in $L[O^\#]$. If one is willing to entirely ignore compatibility with $O^\#$ then there are forcings far simpler than ours which achieve the effect of Theorem 14 for any $F : \text{classes} \rightarrow \text{classes}$, over any model of Gödel-Bernays class theory.

REFERENCES

1. Beller-Jensen-Welch, *Coding the Universe*, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
2. Friedman, *Minimal Universes*, to appear, *Advances in Mathematics*, 1993.
3. M. Stanley, *A Non-Generic Real Incompatible with $O^\#$* , To appear, 1993.